

Old Avestan *xʷa-* and Young Avestan *hauua-* ‘own’

Michiel de Vaan, Leiden

1. The linguistic relationship between Old Avestan and Young Avestan was never one between two natural languages. Initially, it concerned a living (YAv.) and a dead (OAv.) language; the contacts mainly involved lexical influence of OAv. on YAv., and phonetic/ phonological and maybe syntactic influence of the YAv. language on the OAv. texts. After YAv. had also become extinct, both text corpuses came to depend only on the oral transmission by the Zoroastrian priests; the language contact was now mainly characterized by phraseological influence. Phrases and parts of phrases from one language (especially OAv.) were used in the canonization of texts in the other (especially YAv.). We will see in this paper how a proper distinction of these contacts may help to clarify a hitherto unsolved problem in the YAv. grammar.

2. The possessive pronoun of the 3sg. ‘his, her, its own’ is given by the handbooks as OAv., YAv. *xʷa-* and YAv. *huua-*, *hauua-*; compare e.g. BARTHOLOMAE 1904: 783-5, REICHELT 1909: 207, MAYRHOFER 1986-96 II: 787, HOFFMANN-FORSSMAN 1996: 169. These three stems correspond with only one pronoun in the closely related languages Old Persian /*uva*/ ‘own’ and Sanskrit *svá-* ‘one’s own’. Whereas the distribution of the Avestan forms was apparently regarded as insufficiently clear by previous investigators, HOFFMANN-FORSSMAN 1996: 169 propose to derive all three forms from different preforms: they equate Avestan *xʷa-* with Skt. *svá-*, *huua-* with Skt. *suvá-* and *hauua-* with Lat. *suus*. In terms of Proto-Indo-European reconstruction, this would imply that Av. *xʷa-* and *huua-* go back to **suo-* whereas *hauua-* would be the reflex of **seyo-*.

Unfortunately, this hypothesis is undermined by the fact that Skt. *svá-* and *suvá-* are different metrical realizations of the same pronoun Ilr. **syá-*, and these metrical doublets are due to LINDEMAN’s Law. Metrical doublets of initial consonant plus *ii* or *uu* are not to be assumed for OAv. (compare BEEKES 1988: 99), let alone in the YAv. texts. There is no evidence that the sequence **syá-* could yield anything else but *xʷa-* in Avestan. We may put forward an even more important objection: the distribution of *xʷa-*, *huua-* and *hauua-* in Avestan is still unclear. Unless this has been clarified, we cannot start reconstructing earlier stages of their development.

3. In OAv., the forms *huua-* and *hauua-* do not occur. The only stem which does occur is *xʷa-*, viz. in the nom.sg.m. *xʷə*, ins.pl.m.n. *xʷāiš*, nom.sg.f. *xʷāē-cā*, dat.sg.f. *xʷāxiiāi*, and gen.sg.f. *xʷāxiiā*. Seven forms of *xʷa-* are found in YAv. texts, but a careful analysis of the text passages shows that *xʷa-* was not a linguistic reality in YAv. Three of the *xʷa-* forms are OAv. quotations, two of them are probably OAv. adaptations, one of them may be analyzed as the first member of a compound, and one is due to a text corruption.

The identifiable OAv. quotations are:

- the gen.sg.f. *xʷāxiiā*, which occurs in the frequent phrase *tanuuascī̄t xʷāxiiā uštanəm* ‘the life of his own body’, taken from Y 33.14.
- the ins.pl. *xʷāiš* in *tq yazāi xʷāiš nāmənīš* ‘I wish to worship them by means of their names’, a quotation taken from Y 51.22.

- the ins.pl. *x'āiš* in V 5.62 *šīiaoθnāiš x'āiš*, a quotation from Y 31.20 *šīiaoθanāiš x'āiš* 'because of your actions'.

A clear OAv. adaptation in YAv. is the loc.sg. *x'ahmi*, which only occurs in the expression *x'ahmi dqm* 'in his own house' in Vīspere 14.2

x'ahmi dqm x'ahmi ciθre x'ahmi zaoše x'ahmi xšaθre x'ahmi xratuuō x'ahmi āiiaptəm
 'in his own house, in his own family, to his own liking, in his own power, in his own authority, in his own luck'.

The stanza 14.2 must be a later intrusion into the original text of Vīspere 14, since it does not form a logical connection between Vr 14.1 and 14.3. The origin of the second half of Vr 14.2 (not cited here) is known: it is a quotation of the YAv. passage Yt 10.9ff. However, the first half of Vr 14.2 (*x'ahmi ... āiiaptəm*) only occurs here. It seems to have been inspired by several OAv. phrases, among which we recognize *θβahmī dqm* 'in your house' (Y 48.7, 49.10) and *θβahmī ā xšaθrōi* 'in your power' (Y 49.8). Furthermore, the loc.sg. form *dqm* is a typically OAv. endless locative, whereas the YAv. loc.sg. is attested as *dqmi* (Yt 1.25). To all appearances, then, the first part of Vr 14.2 is a remnant of an otherwise lost Gāthic text, and was partly adapted to YAv. grammar. Note also that the text is defective in the sense that *āiiaptəm* is not a locative († *āiiapte*), and that we have to restore *xratuuō* for the attested *ratauuō* in order to get a locative sg. form.

The next YAv. *x'a*-form is probably also an OAv. adaptation, although its source cannot be identified. The gen.sg. *x'ahe* occurs in the phrase *x'ahe gaiiehe x'anuuatō aməšahe* 'of my own sunny immortal life' in Y 9.1 and in Yt 8.11, 10.55 and 10.74. In Y 9.1, the context shows that we are dealing with a later insertion into the original text, so that we may concentrate on the Yašt occurrences. In Yt 8.11 and in Yt 10.55,74 two gods are speaking, viz. Tištrya and Mithra, respectively:

<i>frā nəruiiō ašauuaoiō</i>	'to the truthful men
<i>θβarštahe zrū šušuiiqm</i>	of the allotted life-time I would have gone forth,
<i>x'ahe gaiiehe x'anuuatō aməšahe</i>	[I] of my own sunny immortal life,
<i>upa θβarštahe jaymiiqm</i>	to [them] of the allotted [life-time]
	I would have arrived'. ¹

¹ The two most recent discussions of this passage are LUBOTSKY 1998: 75-77 and KELLENS 2000: 128-130, where the reader will find references to earlier proposals. My translation is based on LUBOTSKY's (p. 77), the main difference being that I assume the second *θβarštahe* to be a repetition of the first, rather than to belong to *gaiiehe*. I follow LUBOTSKY's suggestion that the form *āiiu* 'age', which the Avestan text has after *zrū*, must be a later insertion. Without *āiiu*, we have a fine eight-syllable line **θβarštahja zruyanh cijucijūām*. KELLENS' interpretation is different: '... je me serais mis en route, pour le bien des hommes ašauuans, vers la durée du temps façonné, je serais venu auprès (d'eux) pour toute la durée du temps non façonné qui est celui de ma vie immortelle, (en permanence) exposée au soleil.' He assumes that the second *θβarštahe* must be read as **θβarštahe*, on the strength of the spelling *adβarštahe* in the ms. F1 in two of the three passages; however, initial *a-* in F1 may be explained from perseveration of the final *-a* of the preceding word *upa*. It is also uncertain whether KELLENS' reading *upa θβarštahe jaymiiqm* yields an eight-syllable line, as he assumes. As argued by LUBOTSKY (1997: 148, 149³¹), the 1sg. perf.opt. *jaymiiqm* may rather have been trisyllabic */*jagmi(i)ām*/.

As expected, *x'ahe* refers to the subject of the sentence, but the line *x'ahe gaiiehe x'anuuatō aməšahe* looks strange. The genitive in which all the words stand cannot be logically connected with any other part of the sentence, and the line consists of eleven syllables instead of the expected eight of the surrounding lines. The conclusion is that *x'ahe gaiiehe x'anuuatō aməšahe* is a secondary addition to the YAv. text; apparently, it was a well-known epithet of the gods. We do not know from where it was taken, but an OAv. origin seems quite possible.

An ins.sg.n. form *x'ā* has been claimed to occur in Y 9.25 (compare GELDNER 1886-96 s.v. Y 9.25, or BARTHOLOMAE 1904: 1783), but I do not think that we are dealing with the possessive pronoun. The sentence is usually read as *ušta tē yō x'ā aojaṇha vasō.xšaθrō ahi haoma*, and translated as 'hail to you, who are by your own strength of your own authority, o Haoma'. The form *x'ā* is then analyzed as the ins.sg.n. of *x'a-*, coordinated with *aojaṇha*.

The first problem of this interpretation is the fact that *x'ā* would be redundant: *tē yō aojaṇha vasō.xšaθrō ahi* would have the same meaning. Secondly, the existence of *x'a-* in YAv. would be unique. These problems can be avoided if we suppose that the sequence *-ṇh-* stands for original **-ṇ'h-*, so that we read **aojaṇ'ha*; this error of *ṇh* for **ṇ'h* is frequently attested in Avestan, e.g. in Y 9.4 *vīuuāṇhā* (Skt. *vívásvant-*). The nom.sg. ending *-a* in *aojaṇ'ha* instead of the more frequent ending *-ā < *-ās* (*astuuā*, *druuā*, *vīuuāṇhā*) is shared by other *uant*-stems, such as YAv. *raēuua* 'rich', *amauua* 'strong' and *vərəθrauua* 'victorious', and is due to interference with the adjectives in *-uan*, which have inherited the nom.sg. ending *-uua < *-uān* (thus SCHINDLER 1982: 210).

The retrieval of the adj. **aojahuant-* in Y 9.25 is supported by the Gāthic expression *xšaθrəm aojōnghuuat* (Y 31.4) 'powerful rulership', which is based on a combination of the nouns **kšatram* and **augas* 'rulership and power' which must have existed in Ilr. times, to judge by Y 29.10 *aogō ... xšaθrəmcā* and RV *kṣatrām ... ójas* (cf. SCHLERATH 1960: 131). Returning to the passage Y 9.25, we can go one step further: **aojaṇ'ha* may be combined with preceding *x'ā* as a compound **x'ā.aojaṇ'ha* 'who has his own power', 'who is powerful of his own'. The first member *x'ā* would have the regular form which Ilr. **h₂a°* 'self' yields in YAv. when it is used in compounds, compare *x'ā.aoθra-* 'having own shoes', *x'ā.zaēna-* 'having his own weapon' and others. Long *-ā* is the regular reflex of short **-a* in the auslaut of monosyllables. This solution has the additional advantage that the text of Y 9.25 now shows two parallel compounds in the nom.sg., which both express the fact that Haoma rules 'at will':

*ušta tē yō *x'ā.aojaṇ'ha vasō.xšaθrō ahi haoma*

'hail to you, o Haoma, who are powerful of your own, who rule at will'.

Finally we turn to the loc.pl. *x'aēšu* in Fragment Westergaard 4.2 **x'aēšu dāmohu* 'in his own creatures'. The reading *x'aēšu* is a correction of Westergaard's, since the mss. spell *x'āiš*. It must be noted right away that *x'āiš* is actually the lectio difficilior, since an original form **x'aēšu* might have been expected to retain its final *-u* in front of *dāmohu*. The grammar of the second part of the passage is also defective. FrW 4.2 reads

ahē framraomi spitama xšaiieni hauuanqm dāmanqm azəm yō ahurō mazdā ‘this I say, o Spitama, I will rule my creation, I who am Ahura Mazdā’
naēciš xšaiiāt duždaēnō ahrō mainiiuš zaraθuštra xʼaēšu dāmōhu spitama ‘certainly not, o Zarathuštra Spitama, shall the malevolent Evil Spirit rule my creation’.

The verb *xšaiia-* usually takes the genitive, as in the first part *xšaiieni hauuanqm dāmanqm*, and not the locative as in *xšaiiāt ... dāmōhu*. Furthermore, the pronoun *xʼa-* usually refers to the subject of the clause, as we have rendered it in the translation above. Yet the meaning of the passage FrW 4.2 must clearly be that the Evil Spirit shall not rule *Ahura Mazdā*’s creatures! Taken at face value, the words *xʼaēšu dāmōhu spitama* would suggest that the composer did not notice that the change in verb person should also imply a change in the possessive pronoun. There are other faults too: since the text shows a correct use of *hauua-* in *hauuanqm dāmanqm*, any form of *xʼa-* would be completely unexpected in the following line. In view of the fact that the order *zaraθuštra spitama* is otherwise unknown in YAv. (it is always *spitama zaraθuštra* or only *zaraθuštra*), even *spitama* may be a later addition. In fact, the usual order *spitama zaraθuštra* can be restored if we assume that the last three words *xʼāiš dāmōhu spitama* are a later addition to the text, which would then have read:

ahē framraomi spitama xšaiieni hauuanqm dāmanqm azəm yō ahurō mazdā; naēciš xšaiiāt duždaēnō ahrō mainiiuš zaraθuštra ‘this I say, o Spitama, I will rule my creation, I who am Ahura Mazdā; certainly not, o Zarathuštra, shall the malevolent Evil Spirit rule [them]’.

The loc.pl. *dāmōhu* occurs at various places in YAv., and was probably put into the text as a gloss to show that *dāmanqm* was to be thought as the object of *xšaiiāt*. The form *xʼāiš* may in origin come from a Pahlavī version which had *ān-ī xwēš* ‘own’, the usual translation of *hauua-* in the Pahlavī Vīdēvdād.

4. The variants *huua-* and *hauua-* in YAv. go back to **hauua-* in the archetype. A stem *†huua-* did not exist in YAv. BARTHOLOMAE 1904: 1846 was aware of this fact, and under the heading *hva-* he only refers the reader to the stem *hava-*. In his Avesta edition, GELDNER had edited the majority of forms as *hauua-*, but some forms of the possessive pronoun appear as *huua-*. They were not corrected individually by BARTHOLOMAE, which is probably why a stem *huua-* is still acknowledged by modern handbooks. Yet as to their meaning and use, there is no difference between *hauua-* and the alleged *huua-*. YAv. *hauua-* is used for all three persons, and can refer to the subject, or to a preceding object in the acc. or the dat. In this way, it quite closely parallels Latin *suus*; cf. CALAND 1891: 52.

The stem *hauua-* occurs across all major Avestan books and in all the important mss.² The form *huua-* occurs in a minority of forms, and mainly in the Vīdēvdād. When we look at the variae lectiones, we usually find that the mss. are divided. The most

² The attested forms are m. + n.: nom.sg. *hauuō* (*hauuō uruuā*), acc.sg. *haom* (*haom uruuānəm*), gen.sg. *hauuahe* (*hauuahe urunō*), dat.sg. *hauuāi* (*hauuāi urune*, *h. kāmāica zaošāica*, *h. nāfāi*, *h. zaṇtaue*), ins.sg. *hauua* (*hauua xraθfā*, *h. hizuuā*), loc.sg. *hauue* (*hauue asahi šōiθraēca*), dat.abl.du. *hauuaēibiia* (*h. bāzubiia*, *h. pāḍaēibiia*), gen.pl. *hauuanqm* (*h. dāmanqm*), dat.pl. *hauuāis* (*h. dātāiš*); f. nom.sg. *hauua* (*hauua daēna*), acc.sg. *hauuqm* (*h. frauuašīm*), gen.abl.sg. *hauuāiā(sə)* (*h. daēnaiiā*, *h. tanuuō*).

frequent is the acc.sg.f. *hauuqm* in what is spelled by GELDNER as *huuqm tanūm* and *huuqm daēnqm*. The original form *hauuqm* is often given by one or two of the three ms. classes of the Vīdēvdād, especially by the IrVS Jp1 and Mf2³. Two other V forms which GELDNER edits with *huu*^o may be corrected to *hauu*^o, viz. the nom.sg.m. V 13.8 *hauuō uruua* and the nom.pl.m. V 19.42 *hauuāñhō puθrāñhō*⁴.

There remain a small number of cases of *huu*^o without v.ll., but they can be ascribed to the poor mss. tradition: Yt 10.112 *huua* (nom.du. **hauua pasu vīra*), and many Nērangestān forms, e.g. *huuaēibiia* for **hauuaēibiia ušibiia* 'with his own two ears'.

It is evident that all the forms of *hauua-* and *huua-* belong to one paradigm as regards their meaning and function. We have now seen that with respect to their form, the stem *hauua-* is older, being both more numerous and much better represented in the good mss. The decisive blow to a possible stem **hūa-* comes from the acc.sg.m. form *haom*: whereas all other forms of *hauua-* could, if one would want to maintain **hūua-*, be regarded as having a very recent epenthetic vowel *-a-* (which does occur in clusters *-Cuu-*, but not usually in such a massive degree), the acc.sg.m. *haom* must go back to **hauuəm* < **hauam*.

5. OAv. *x'a-* and YAv. *hauua-* necessarily go back to two different PAv. forms: **hūa-* and **haua-*. How is this difference to be explained?

At first sight, it seems quite possible that both forms go back to PIE. Whereas OAv. *x'a-* exactly corresponds to the Skt. form *svá-*, YAv. *hauua-* might be regarded as the Avestan counterpart of Old Latin *souos* which gave Latin *suus*. Reflexes of **suo-* and **seuo-* co-occur in Greek, where we find *hós* (Dor. *wós*) beside *heós*; it would not be strange if Iranian had also retained both variants. On the other hand, the reconstruction of a separate PIE possessive pronoun **seuos* is disputed, and e.g. BEEKES 1995: 211 reconstructs only **suós* for the 3sg. possessive pronoun 'own'. The forms which point to **seuos* may be innovations of the separate branches, which arose under the influence of the reflexive pronoun PIE acc. sg. **se*, gen.sg. **seue* on original **suós*.

The uncertainty of a PIE **seuó-* already suggests that YAv. *hauua-* may well be a recent innovation, and this impression is further strengthened when we take into account the fact that *hauua-* is isolated within YAv. itself. All compounds with 'own' as a first member reflect **hūa*^o, viz. *x'a.aoθra-* 'having his own shoes', *x'a.dāta-* 'of his own creation', etc. To judge from other Iranian correspondences, this was the Plr. state of affairs: Old Persian *uva*^o in *uvāmaršiyu-* 'having his own death' = 'natural death', or MP *hwt'y* 'god', NP *xud* < **hūadāta-*. YAv. also retains **hūa-* in the adverb Plr. **hūatah* > *x'atō* 'by itself', compare Khot. *hvatā* 'by itself, separately', Man.Sogd. *xwtyy* 'self', MP NP *xwad* 'self, indeed', etc. The correspondence **hūai*^o of Skt. *svayám* 'himself, itself' is probably preserved in the adj. *x'aepaiθia-* 'own' < **hūai-patja-* (OP *uvaipašiya-*, MP *xwēš*, etc.) and in the noun *x'aētu-* 'family'.

³ E.g. V 8.36ff. K1.Pt2 *huuqm*, Jp1.Mf2 and L1.2 *hauuqm*; V 8.98 K1a *huuqm*, Pt2 *hauuqm*, Jp1.Mf2 and L1.2 *hauuqm*; V 9.31ff. L4.K1a *huuqm*, Jp1.Mf2 and L1.2 *hauuqm*, L4 also *hauuqm*; V 10.18 K1 and L1.2 *huuqm*, Jp1.Mf2 *hauuqm*.

⁴ V 13.8: L4.K1a *hauuō*; Jp1.Mf2 *hūuō*; L1 *hauuō*, L2 *hūuō*. V 19.42 L2.Br1.K10 *hūuāñhō*, L1.M2.B2 *hauuāñhō*; Jp1.Mf2 *hanāñhō*, a clear corruption of **hau(u)āñhō*; V 19.42 is absent from the PV text.

The picture is clear: the form **h_ya-* is original in all Iranian languages and has been preserved in non-inflected state in many YAv. words, whereas only the inflected possessive pronoun ‘his, her own’ takes the YAv. form *hauua-*. This renders it probable that PIr. **h_ya-* was replaced in YAv. by **haya-*. How did this replacement arise?

6. Our first impulse is to compare the development of the possessive pronouns for the first and second person sg. In OAv., we find them represented by the inflected adjectives *ma-* ‘my’ and *ðβa-* ‘your’, but these have disappeared from YAv. Instead, YAv. uses the frozen gen.sg. forms *mana* for the first person, and the enclitic dative *tē* for the second person; e.g. *mana xšad^{re}* ‘under my rule’. Although there are no clear examples, it might be argued that the gen.sg. *tauua* of the 2sg. pers. pronoun could also once be used as a possessive. In that case, OAv. **h_ya-* might have been changed to **haya-* by analogy with the 2sg. *tauua*. The model would have been provided by the identical initial consonant of the stressed and the enclitic possessive pronouns:

2sg. YAv. encl. *tē*, poss. *tauua*

3sg. YAv. encl. *hē*, poss. **h_ya-* → *hauua-*

Nevertheless, I think that we must reject this explanation. *Hauua-* is an inflected adjective, and therefore has a different syntactic status than *mana* and *tauua*. If Avestan had wished to create an (uninflected) stressed form parallel to *mana* and *tauua* there would have been a better candidate for this analogy in the form of the gen.sg.m/n. *ahe* of *a-*. In fact, we do find *ahe* used in a parallel fashion to *mana*, viz. in the expression *mana raiia x^{ar}ənanhaca* (Yt 5.89) ‘on account of my wealth and fortune’, a paraphrase of *ahe raiia x^{ar}ənanhaca* (Y 57 and the Yašts) ‘on account of his wealth and fortune’.

7. The origin of *hauua-* may rather be explained by its functional proximity to the enclitic dative of the pers. pron. *hē*, which is used for the 3rd person, both sg. and pl. When the possessor is the subject of the sentence, *hauua-* is used: *haom uruuānəm yazamaide* ‘we worship our own soul’. When the possessor is a different person, usually someone who has been mentioned before, YAv. uses *hē*: Y 19.6 *tarō pərətūm hē uruuānəm (...) frapāraieni* ‘his soul I will bring across the bridge’. Both pronouns can be nicely compared in the same text V 2.11 *iðra fracarənta pasuuasca staorāca mašiiāca hauuqm anu uštīm zaošəmca, yaðā kaðaca hē zaošō* ‘and there went about small cattle and large cattle and men according to their own wish and liking, in the way that (was) his liking [viz. of Yima]’.

The pronoun *hē* has eventually taken over some of the functions of *hauua-*, as in Yt 5.127 *hā hē maiðim niiāzata* ‘she has tied (for) herself (around) the waist’, which, if the composer had wanted to stress that it was *her* waist and not someone else’s, could have been expressed as *hā fhaom maiðim niiāzata*. It is in general quite common for the gen. or possessive dative of the personal pronoun to break into the sphere of the possessive; compare English *his*, originally the gen.sg. of Old English *hē*.

If **h_ya-* stood functionally so close to **hai*, it becomes understandable that it was replaced by **haya-*, by means of the introduction of initial **ha-*. Further pressure to introduce an initial sequence **ha-* may have been exerted by other members of the pronominal system, namely by the demonstratives. We find initial *ha-* in the nom.sg. forms of the Avestan demonstrative pronouns of nearby deixis, which are OAv. f. *hā*,

YAv. m. *hā* and *hə̌*, *hō̌*. In the demonstratives of remote deixis, the nom.sg. OAv. *huuō* comes from Ilr. **hau*, which is also reflected in OP *hauv*. This pronoun resembled the possessive **hūa* even more.

Old Avestan		Young Avestan	
personal, demonstrative	possessive	personal, demonstrative	possessive
gen.dat.sg. <i>*hai</i>	<i>*hūa-</i>	gen.dat.sg. <i>*hai</i>	<i>*haua-</i>
nearby: nom.sg.m. <i>*ha</i>		nom.sg.m. <i>*ha</i> and <i>*hah</i>	
remote: nom.sg.m. <i>*hau</i>		nom.sg.m.f. <i>hāu</i>	

The spread of the personal pronoun **hai* to the possessive, as in *hē uruuānəm* above, seems to be of YAv. date, since OAv. *hōi* can still be interpreted as an independent dative in all instances. This YAv. change in the use of **hai* implies that the replacement of **hūa-* by **haua-* is probably also of YAv. date, or can be dated to the transition period between OAv. and YAv. As a consequence, the difference between OAv. *xʰa-* and YAv. *hauua-* can be the result of a simple chronological difference between the two stages of Avestan; it is not necessary to assume that OAv. and YAv. are based on two different Old Iranian dialects, spoken in different regions.

8. The story of Avestan *xʰa-* and *h(a)uua-* would not be complete without a discussion of the alleged reflexive pronoun. All Avestan handbooks acknowledge the existence of a separate reflexive pronoun of the third person, equivalent of German *sich*, albeit with a very defective attestation. BARTHOLOMAE 1904: 1845 mentions three forms: the dat.sg. *huuāuuōiia*, the dat.sg. *xʰāi* and a gen.sg. **xʰaṇhe*; similarly REICHEL 1909: 205. The restoration of the gen.sg. form **xʰaṇhe* in N 54 was disproved by WAAG 1941: 67, who saw that the mss. rather suggest the restoration of a form of the possessive *hauua-*, viz. gen.sg.m. **hauuaṇhe* or maybe gen.sg.f. **hauuaṇhā*.

The alleged dat.sg. form *xʰāi* occurs in V 4.1, and it can be shown that *xʰāi* is a later gloss which entered the Avestan text from the interlinear Pahlavī translation. The sentence and Bartholomae’s translation of it read as follows:

aēšqmcit̥ ... maēθanahe xʰāi pairi.gəuruuāiieiti

‘als ob er die Habe des Hauses für seinen Bedarf wegnähme.’

Bartholomae assumes that *aēšqmcit̥* represents a hapax *aēšā-* ‘goods’, which is further unknown and has no etymology. A better translation of the sentence can be achieved if we take *aēšqmcit̥* as the gen.pl. of the demonstrative pronoun *a-*, and *maēθanahe* as the complement of *pairi.gəuruuāiieiti*; *xʰāi* is best left out:

aēšqmcit̥ ... maēθanahe [xʰāi] pairi.gəuruuāiieiti ‘he plunders even their home’.

The form *x'āi* shows a strange vacillation between *x'ā* and *x'āi* in the PV and the IrVS, and *x'āiš* in the InVS⁵. This last form *x'āiš* of the InVS indicates that this word is an 'avesticized' form of the word in the Pahlavī-version, viz. *xwēših* 'kinship', which served to translate Avestan *maēdāna-*. This confirms our earlier assumption: the original Avestan text was *aēšqmciṭ maēdānahe pairi.gəuruuāiieiti*, and the double genitive with which the verb form is constructed exactly matches that of V 8.32 *yaṭ ... mašiiānqm xšudranqm pairi.gəuruuāiieiti* 'when he accepts the seed of men'⁶.

This leaves the form *huuāuuōiia*, which must reflect the development **h_uabja* > **h_uajja* > **h_uājja* > *huuāuuōiia*. It occurs⁷ in Y 59.30 *huuāuuōiia yaṭ zaoθre* 'for you(rself), the zaotar'. The preform **h_uabja* is best analyzed as the possessive **h_ua-* with the pronominal dat.sg. ending **-bja*. Its formation is exactly parallel to the personal pronouns OAv. *maibiiā*, YAv. *māuuōiia* 'to me' and OAv. *xšmaibiiā*, YAv. *xšmāuuōiia* 'to you (pl.)'. Their preforms **mabja* and **šmabja* contain *ma-* 'my' and *xšma-* 'your' plus the ending **-bja*. The correlation with the noun *zaotar-* which we find with *huuāuuōiia* is also attested with **mabja* in YAv.: Y 68.2 *māuuāiia zaoθre* 'and to me, the zaotar'; compare also Y 20.3 *xšmāuuōiia ... yaṭ saošiiānt'biio* 'to you, the saviours'. We may thus regard **h_uabja* as an inner-Avestan formation, which must have existed before YAv. replaced the possessive **h_ua-* by **h_uā-*; **h_uabja* escaped this replacement because it was part of the paradigm of the personal pronouns.

We must address one remaining problem in the explanation of *huuāuuōiia*, viz. the question why **h_u* - did not yield *x'*. The sequence **h_uā-* always yields Avestan *x'ā* - except in the word *huuarə* 'sun', and in compounds in which the first member *hu-* 'good' was restored, such as *huuaspa-* 'having good horses'; cf. DE VAAN 2003: 565-568 for a full discussion of the evidence. This means that the expected outcome of **h_uabja* would be *†x'āuuōiia*. It seems that the deviating form *huuāuuōiia* may be explained phonetically if we take into account two other exceptional forms with *huuā°* from **h_ua-* 'self', viz. Yt 13.146 *huuāuuant-* 'like himself' < **h_uā-_uant-*⁸ and V 13.39 *huuāuuāstra-*⁹ 'having his own garment' < **h_ua-_uāstra-*. Like *huuāuuōiia*, these two forms have an initial syllable **h_uā-* followed by **_u* in the anlaut of the next syllable; there are no counterexamples of the type *†x'āuu°* attested in Avestan. Therefore, we may surmise that the change in pronunciation of **h_u* > *x'*, which took place in initial position, was impeded by a following **-_u-*. Phonetically, this might be interpreted as the retention of **_u* because it was 'supported' by another **_u* in the next syllable. Chronologically, this would imply that the change **h_u* > *x'* must be dated after the change of intervocalic **b* > **_u* in YAv.

⁵ V.II. PV L4 *x'ā*, Pt2 *x'āi*, B1.MI3 *x'āi*; InVS L2.Br1.K10.Dh1 *x'āi*, L1.B2.M2.O2 *x'āiš*; IrVS Jp1 *x'ā*, Mf2 *x'āi*.

⁶ GELDNER 1877: 68 already assumed that the form *x'āi* is a corruption of the text, but suggested that *x'āi* may have been a misreading of *ahmāi*.

⁷ The dat.sg. *huuāuuōiia* in Nērangestān 55 is unclear; the traditional translation as 'aus eigenem [Entschluss]' seems very uncertain to me.

⁸ Compare OAv. *mauuant-* (for **mā_uant-*) 'someone like me', *θβāuuant-* 'like you (sg.)' and *xšmāuuant-* 'like you (pl.)', which have also been formed on the basis of the corresponding possessive pronouns.

⁹ In which *-ā-* is probably due to the influence of the following form *x'ā.aoθra-* 'having his own shoes'.

9. Due attention to the influence of OAv. on the YAv. language has revealed that the possessive pronoun *x'a-* 'one's own' only existed in OAv. The YAv. form was *hauua-*, which can be explained as an analogical replacement of **h₂ua-* by **haya-* due to other personal and demonstrative pronouns in initial **ha-*. The evidence for an Avestan reflexive pronoun is confined to *huuāuuōiia*, which is an inner-Avestan formation on the basis of the possessive pronoun **h₂ua-*.

References:

- BARTHOLOMAE, C.
1904: *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, Strassburg.
- BEEKES, R.
1988: *A grammar of Gatha-Avestan*, Leiden.
1995: *Comparative Indo-European linguistics*, Amsterdam - Philadelphia.
- CALAND, W.
1891: *Zur Syntax der awestischen Pronomina*, Amsterdam.
- GELDNER, K.
1877: *Über die Metrik des jüngeren Avesta*, Tübingen.
1886-96 (ed.): *Avesta. The sacred books of the Parsis*, Stuttgart.
- HOFFMANN, K. and B. FORSSMAN
1996: *Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre*, Innsbruck.
- KELLENS, J.
2000: L'ellipse du temps, *Anusantatyai. Festschrift für Johanna Narten zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. A. Hintze and E. Tichy), Dettelbach (= *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft. Beiheft* N.F. 19), 127-31.
- LUBOTSKY, A.
1997: The Indo-Iranian reflexes of PIE **CRHUV*, *Sound law and analogy. Papers in honor of Robert S.P. Beekes on the occasion of his 60th birthday* (ed. A. Lubotsky), 139-154.
1998: Avestan *zruuan-*, *ΠΟΛΥΤΡΟΠΙΟΝ. К 70-летию Владимира Николаевича Топорова*, Moskva, 73-85.
- MAYRHOFER, M.
1986-1996: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen (EWAia)*, 2 volumes, Heidelberg.
- REICHEL, H.
1909: *Awestisches Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg.
- SCHINDLER, J.
1982: Zum Nom.Sing.m. der *nt*-Partizipien im Jungavestischen. *Investigationes philologicae et comparativae: Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser*, ed. E. Neu, Wiesbaden, 186-209.
- SCHLERATH, B.
1960: *Das Königtum im Rig- und Atharvaveda*, Wiesbaden.
- DE VAAN, M.
2003: *The Avestan vowels*, Amsterdam - New York.

WAAG, A.

1941: *Nirangistan. Der Awestatraktat über die rituellen Vorschriften*, Leipzig.

Universiteit Leiden, Faculteit der Letteren
Opleiding vergelijkende taalwetenschappen
Postbus 9515
NL-2300 RA Leiden
m.a.c.de.vaan@let.leidenuniv.nl

Michiel de Vaan